

GN 480  
.5  
.K7  
Copy 1

ANTHROPOLOGICAL PAPERS  
OF  
THE AMERICAN MUSEUM  
OF NATURAL HISTORY

VOL. XIX, PART III

KINSHIP IN THE PHILIPPINES

BY

A. L. KROEBER



NEW YORK  
PUBLISHED BY ORDER OF THE TRUSTEES  
1919

# American Museum of Natural History.

## PUBLICATIONS IN ANTHROPOLOGY.

---

In 1906 the present series of Anthropological Papers was authorized by the Trustees of the Museum to record the results of research conducted by the Department of Anthropology. The series comprises octavo volumes of about 350 pages each, issued in parts at irregular intervals. Previous to 1906 articles devoted to anthropological subjects appeared as occasional papers in the Bulletin and also in the Memoir series of the Museum. A complete list of these publications with prices will be furnished when requested. All communications should be addressed to the Librarian of the Museum.

The recent issues are as follows: —

### Volume XIX.

I. The Whale House of the Chilkat. By George T. Emmons. Pp. 1-33. Plates I-IV, and 6 text figures. 1916. Price, 1.00.

II. The History of Philippine Civilization as Reflected in Religious Nomenclature. By A. L. Kroeber. Pp. 35-67. 1918. Price, \$.25.

III. Kinship in the Philippines. By A. L. Kroeber. Pp. 69-84. 1919. Price, \$.25.

IV. (In preparation.)

ANTHROPOLOGICAL PAPERS  
OF  
THE AMERICAN MUSEUM  
OF NATURAL HISTORY

VOL. XIX, PART III

---

KINSHIP IN THE PHILIPPINES

BY

*revised*  
A. L. KROEBER



NEW YORK

PUBLISHED BY ORDER OF THE TRUSTEES

1919

*Copy 2*

GN480  
5  
K7

6  
6  
6  
6  
6  
6  
6

61.61-475.8x

KINSHIP IN THE PHILIPPINES.

By A. L. KROEBER.



## CONTENTS.

	PAGE.
INTRODUCTION . . . . .	73
THE DATA . . . . .	75
ANALYSIS OF THE DATA . . . . .	78
RECONSTRUCTION OF THE ANCIENT SYSTEM . . . . .	81
LINES OF DEVELOPMENT OF THE ANCIENT SYSTEM . . . . .	82
CORRESPONDENCE OF INSTITUTIONS AND THE KINSHIP SCHEME . . . . .	83
THEORETICAL PRINCIPLES INVOLVED . . . . .	84





#### INTRODUCTION.

This essay attempts a review of the more readily available data on the terminologies in use, among the natives of the Philippine Islands, for relatives by blood and marriage; an analysis of these data with a view to the determination of the Filipino system of kinship designation at a former period; the lines of growth of this system and their affecting causes; the relation of the system to contemporary institutions and cultural phases; and methodological inferences.

March, 1919.



## THE DATA.

The materials used are the following:—

Nabaloi of Kabayan, Benguet. From manuscript available through the courtesy of the author, Mr. C. R. Moss.

Kankanai of Bauco, Lepanto. From M. Vanoverbergh. *A Grammar of Lepanto Igorot as it is spoken at Bauco*. Philippine Islands, Bureau of Science, Division of Ethnology. Publications, volume 5, part 6, 1917. These people are Kankanai according to the classification of H. O. Beyer, *Population of the Philippine Islands in 1916*, Manila, 1917. They seem nearly as close to the Bontok in speech and culture as to the most southerly Kankanai of northern Benguet. American students are inclined to simplify ethnic relations of the pagans in the Philippines by making tribal or national groups coincide with subprovincial limits.

Bontok, of the town and subprovince of the same name. From C. W. Seide, nadel, *The First Grammar of the Igorot Language as spoken by the Bontoc Igorot*-Chicago, 1909; A. E. Jenks, *The Bontoc Igorot*, Philippine Islands Ethnological Survey, Publications, volume 1, 1905; W. C. Clapp, *A Vocabulary of the Igorot Language as spoken by the Bontok Igorot*, Bureau of Science, Division of Ethnology, Publications, volume 5, part 3, 1908; collated and revised with the assistance of Mrs. Margaret P. Waterman, for a number of years resident at Bontok.

Ifugao of Kiangnan, Ifugao. R. F. Barton, *Ifugao Law*, University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology, volume 15, page 110, 1919.

Tagalog. Julius Miles, *Metodo para aprender al lenguaje Tagalog*. Barcelona, 1887.

Subanun of northwestern Mindanao. J. P. Finley and W. Churchill, *The Subanu*, Carnegie Institution of Washington, publication no. 184, Washington, 1913.

Lanao Moro of northwestern Mindanao. C. W. Winslow, *A Vocabulary and Phrase Book of the Lanao Moro Dialect*, Bureau of Science, Division of Ethnology, Publications, volume 5, part 5, 1913.

Magindanao Moro of western Mindanao. R. S. Porter, *A Primer and Vocabulary of the Moro Dialect*, Bureau of Insular Affairs, Washington, 1903.

Moro of Sulu Island. T. H. Haynes, *English, Sulu, and Malay Vocabulary*. Journal of the Straits Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society, volume 16, pages 321 to 384, 1885, volume 18, pages 193-239, 1886.

Malay. F. A. Swettenham, *Vocabulary of the English and Malay Languages*. London, 1901.

The Nabaloi, Kankanai, Bontok, and Ifugao are Igorot, that is, members of the great block of pagan mountaineers in northern Luzon, a people somewhat distinct racially from the lowlanders, and less affected than any other, except perhaps a few small parasitic tribes, by Indian, Arab, or European influences. The Subanun are pagans in Mindanao, dominated by Mohammedan neighbors, but distinctly backward cul-

turally. The three Moro groups are of course Mohammedan. Of them the Sulu have probably been most and the Lanao least intimately in contact with Mohammedan Malaysia in general. The Christian Tagalog of central Luzon are the nationality most advanced in western civilization of any on the islands.

While these groups offer a fair sample—geographically as well as culturally—of the thirty or more nationalities recognized in the Philippine archipelago, there is no doubt that farther inclusions would have been desirable. It is particularly unfortunate that the Bisaya, the largest and most central nationality of the islands, are unrepresented. The Ilokano, Pampanga, and Bikol are other Christian groups on which information would have been worth while. The same holds of the Cagayan and the eastern Igorot divisions that are linguistically affiliated with them. In Mindanao an eastern pagan tribe, such as the Manobo, Bagobo, or Mandaya, would have increased geographical balance. But many works of ethnology do not include kinship systems; the dictionaries that exist of most of the languages referred to seem to be difficult of access in the United States; and the internal unity of the available material does not make it appear that its doubling in bulk would even approximately double the accuracy of the inferences drawn.

The following are the abbreviations used: N, Nabaloi; K, Kanakanai; B, Bontok; I, Ifugao; S, Subanun; L, Lanao Moro; M, Magindanao Moro; Sl, Sulu Moro; T, Tagalog; Mal., Malay.

*Father:* N, K, B, I, L, Sl, T, ama; S, g-ama; M, ama, bapa; Mal., bapa.<sup>a</sup>

*Mother:* N, K, B, I, L, M, Sl, ina; S, g-ina; Mal., ibu, mak.<sup>a</sup>

*Son, Daughter:* N, anaka; K, B, I, T, Mal., anak; S, bata; L, M, wata; Sl, anak, bata-bata.) In all languages words like lalaki, lee, "male," and babai, fafai, libong, "female," are added, to these and to other indeterminate terms, when sex is to be definitely specified; just as we use cousin, but help out with "male cousin" or "girl cousin" at need. Malay uses lakilaki and prempuan.

*Sibling,* irrespective of age or sex; N, agi; B, ötad, agi; I, tulang; S, g-ilugu; Sl, kaka; T, kapatid; Mal., lusud sa tian.<sup>b</sup>

*Older sibling:* K, agi; B, yuna; L, kaka; T, kaka, panganai.

*Older brother:* M, kakal (*sic*); Sl, makulong, magulang (also given as "sister"); T, kuya; Mal., abang.

*Older sister:* M, kaka (*sic*); T, ati; Mal., kakak (Haynes, "older sibling").

*Younger sibling:* K, yugtan; B, anochi; L, ari; Mal., adik.

*Younger brother:* Sl, taimanghud.

*Younger sister:* M, ali.

Sibling terms are often given incompletely in the sources, and rarely without ambiguity.

*Grandparent*: N, K, I, L, Sl, apo; B, apo, ikit; S, g-apo; M, apu; T, nuno; Mal., nenek, datoh.

*Grandchild*: N, I, T, apo; M, apu; B, apo or *child*; Mal., chuchu.

*Great-grandparent*: B, apo; K, ka-apo-an; Mal., moyang.

*Great-grandchild*: Mal., piot.

*Uncle, paternal or maternal*: N, pang-ama-an; K, alitao; B, alitau or *father*; I, *father*, sometimes ulitao; L, M, bapa; T, ama-in; Mal., bapa sudara, pa'su.<sup>c</sup>

*Uncle, paternal*: S, manak.

*Uncle, maternal*: S, g-aya.

*Aunt, paternal or maternal*: N, pang-ina-an; K, ikit; B, *mother*; I, *mother*, sometimes ulitao; L, M, babu; Sl, babu or ina-han; T, ali; Mal., mak muda, mak su.<sup>d</sup>

*Nephew, Niece*: N, pang-anak-ana; K, kam-onak-en; B, I, *child*; M, pagi-wata-n; Sl, anak-un; T, pam-ank-in; Mal., anak sudara.

*Cousin*: N, kasingsing; K, sin-pi-n-s-en; B, kayim; L, M, Sl, tüngud, tüngüd, tungut; T, pinsan; Mal., pupu.

*Parent-in-law*: K, in-apo-'n; K, B, katugangan, katukangan; I, *father, mother*; S, ponongangan; M, bapa ("father-in-law"); T, bi-ana-n; Mal., mertua, mentua.

*Child-in-law*: N, in-apo-'n; I, *child*; M, paki-wata-n (*sic*, for pagi-?); T, manugang, Mal., menantu.

*Sibling-in-law*: N, bayana; B, kassud; I, aidu.

*Brother-in-law*: K, kasud; M, bati; T, bayao.

*Sister-in-law*: K, aido; T, hipag.

"*Brother-in-law by sister, sister-in-law*:" Mal., ipar (*cf.* T, last entry)

"*Brother-in-law by wife*:" Mal., biras (*cf.* T, next entry).

*Spouse's sibling's spouse*: B, ab-filad; T, ang bilas.

*Child-in-law's parent*: T, baisan, balai

*Spouse of kin of preceding generation*: I, ama-on, ina-on, ulitao-n.

*Spouse*: N, K, B, T, asawa.

*Wife*: I, inaya; S, sawa; L, karoma.

*Step-parent*: T, *uncle, aunt*; Mal., *father tiri, mother tiri*.

*Step-child*: Mal., *child tiri*.

<sup>a</sup> O. Scheerer, The Batán Dialect as a Member of the Philippine Group of Languages, Bureau of Science, Division of Ethnology, Publications, volume 5, part 1, 1908, 38-41, gives the terms for father, mother, and child in a number of languages not represented here, as follows. "Father" is always *ama* except for a few phonetic variants: Pampanga *ibpa*, Bisaya of Panay *amai*, Tirurai *abai*. "Mother" always *ina*, except, similarly, Pampanga *indu*, Bisaya of Panay *inang, ilai*, Tirurai *ideng*, Bagobo *ine*. "Child," regularly *anak*, except Kalamian *ana*, Tirurai *onok*, Magindanao *wata*, Bagobo *bata*, Bikol *aki* (*anak* is buffalo foetus.)

Scheerer, *ibid.*, 42 gives the following for brother, sister: Batán *kaktek*, Cagayan *vagi*, Ginaan (Kalinga) *sunut*, Ilokano and (Benguet?) Kankanaí *kabsat*, Lepanto (Kankanaí) *besat*, Bontok *una, ptad* (for *otad*?—but *cf.* Tagalog, Pampanga), Nabaloi and Pangasinan *agi*, Pampanga *kapatad*, Tagalog *kapatid*, Bikol *tugang* (*cf.* Ifugao *tulang*), Bisaya of Panay *utud* (*cf.* Bontok *otad*), Magindanao *lusud sa tian* (Malay, not native.) Bagobo *adi* ("younger brother, friend"). Reed, Negritos of Zambales, Ethnological Survey, Publications, volume 2, part 1, 80, 1904, gives, also for brother or sister, Sambal of Iba *talasaka*, of Bolinao *busat* (*cf.* Ilokano, etc.), Negrito *patel* (*cf.* Pampanga, Tagalog). This adds two widely distributed stems (*ka-besat* and (*ka*)-*pated*).

<sup>c</sup> Reed, *ibid.*, Sambal of Iba, *uncle, bapa*.

<sup>d</sup> Reed, *ibid.*, aunt, Sambal of Iba *dara*, of Bolinao *dada*, Negrito *indo* (*cf.* Pampanga *indu*, mother).

## ANALYSIS OF THE DATA.

*Father: amq.* Magindanao uses also *bapa*, which is either a loan from Malay, or a non-differentiation of use of a term for uncle and father.

*Mother: ina.* Malay alone shows *ibu* and *mak*, of which the latter seems to mean both aunt and mother, parallel to *bapa*.

*Son, Daughter:* Luzon and Malay, *anak*; Mindanao, *anak* or *wata*; but either term means child generically.

*Brother, Sister:* The material is incomplete, but indicates greater variability than for any other set of relationships. The outstanding features are (1) normally a generic term for any brother or sister, which is perhaps the most frequently used; (2) normally, but not always, separate terms for older sibling and younger sibling; (3) no distinction for sex except for older brother and sister in the languages of the two most civilized peoples, Tagalog and Malay; and (4) an enormous variability of the terms used. The commonest are *agi*, *ari*, *ali*, *adik*, which denotes variously sibling or older sibling or younger sibling or older sister, and occurs in almost every language; *kaka* for older sibling, of either or both sexes, in Tagalog, Moro, and Malay; and *ka-besat*, *ka-pated*, *otad*, and *tulang*, all meaning sibling generically, each in two or more separate languages. Other terms have only local usage, and are therefore mostly late coinages. It is noticeable that paucity and generalization of terms, both as regards sex and age, is greatest among the rude pagan peoples, in Mindanao as well as Luzon. Christians and Mohammedans are more given to particularizing. Whether they have elaborated or the pagans have reduced their terminology is not clear. The former process seems the more likely because the culture of the Tagalog and Moro and Malay has visibly formed by accretion of importations, whereas there is no evidence that the culture of the pagans has suffered reduction in respects other than kinship. However, separate terms for older and younger sibling do occur among the pagans also. It seems therefore that two impulses may long have been operative in all the languages; one to distinguish age among siblings, the other to class all siblings together. More widely comparative Malaysian studies will no doubt settle this point. But sex distinctions are clearly an accompaniment of more composite culture, and not original.

*Uncle, Aunt, Nephew, Niece.* One outstanding feature is the absence of distinction of the line of descent. Only Subanun has *manak* for father's brother and *g-aya* for mother's brother, and both these terms stand etymologically isolated in the list. The other notable trait is the poverty of specific terms for this class of relationships. So far as data go, every language lacks a stem meaning nephew-niece, but uses either its word for "child" outright, or a derivative from "child," or "child" plus a descriptive epithet. To a less degree, corresponding usage prevails for uncle and aunt. The Igorot use either "father" and "mother," or a derivative therefrom, or the term *alitao*. Kankanai alone has *ikit* for aunt, which occurs in Bontok for grandparent. Tagalog derives uncle from father, and for aunt uses *ali*, which may be an original sibling term. Moro has special words, *bapa* and *babu*, of which the former occurs in Sambal and in Malay for father and uncle, while *babu* is replaced by Malay *mak*, denoting both the mother and the aunt. It is notable that in Malay these two generic words *bapa* and *mak* are augmented by *sudara* or *su* when they are to specify the collateral relative. The general inference from the data at large is that there are no ancient specific terms for uncle, aunt, nephew, or niece, or if there were, that there has been a general inclination to their disuse.

*Grandparents and Grandchildren.* The prevalent term for this entire group of relations is *apo*. As this is also a term of deference, it appears that it is either a common noun which was applied to elders and grandparents and then by reciprocity to grandchildren; or that it is an originally reciprocal kinship term, whose application to older relatives predominated in native consciousness and thus was extended into an honorific. A second stem is represented by Tagalog *nuno*, Malay *nenek*, grandparent. Tagalog retains *apo* for grandchild, Malay has replaced it by *chuchu*. Nowhere is sex distinguished in this class of relatives.

*Great-grandparents, Great-grandchildren.* Data are scant. The Igorot seem to use *apo* or derivatives from *apo*. Malay has specific terms.

*Cousin.* There is no general word. Mohammedans and Christians use a variety of terms with European significance. The Igorot also have distinct words, which however seem to mean really kinsman, companion, or friend. It is likely that the Tagalog, Moro, and Malay terms originated similarly.

*Parent-in-law, Child-in-law.* Sex is not distinguished except in Magindanao, which appears to use the father-uncle and mother-aunt terms. Ifugao says merely father, mother, or child. Magindanao uses a derivative from child for child-in-law. Nabaloi employs a self-reciprocal derivative from *apo*, grandparent-grandchild. Kankanai and Bontok have a distinct term *katukangan* for parent-in-law, the ending of which may reappear in Subanun *ponongangan*: both words are obviously expanded from simpler stems. The terms for child-in-law in these three languages are not available. Tagalog has a distinct word for child-in-law, *manugang*, and possibly for parent-in-law, *bianan*. Malay follows a different principle from the Philippine languages: *mentua* is parent-in-law, *menantu* child-in-law. If these two terms go back to the same root, they constitute the only case of even approximate verbal reciprocity in Malay.

*Brother-in-law, Sister-in-law.* So far as the data go, each language normally has terms of its own. Kankanai *kasud*, brother-in-law, reappears in Bontok, and *aido*, sister-in-law, in Ifugao, but in each case with the more generic meaning of sibling-in-law. Nabaloi also does not discriminate sex. Tagalog does. It seems therefore that the distinction is characteristic of complex as contrasted with simple civilization. Malay adheres to a different principle: the sex of the person denoted is indeterminate, but there appear to be distinct words according as the connection is through one's spouse or sibling. The two Malay terms however reappear in Tagalog, although with different meaning.

*Other Connections by Marriage.* Bontok and Tagalog possess terms, which seem to be etymologically related, by which the spouses of siblings refer to each other. For Tagalog two terms are given as used by the parents of spouses. These may be formed on the analogy of Spanish *consuegros*. Ifugao sometimes adds *-on* to the words for father, mother, uncle, aunt, to designate the spouses of kin of an older generation. There are likely to be unrecorded terms, corresponding to those here mentioned, in other languages.

*Husband and Wife:* *asawa* is the commonest term. It seems always to have the generic meaning of spouse.

*Step-relatives.* Tagalog calls step-parents uncle or aunt. Magindanao similarly uses its uncle-father term *bapa* for stepfather. In other languages data are lacking. Malay adds *tiri* precisely as we prepose "step-." This does not appear to be a native Filipino practice, and probably represents an adaptation of Malay to Eurasiatic practice.



## RECONSTRUCTION OF THE ANCIENT SYSTEM.

Filipino kinship systems appear to reduce to the following scheme:—

- 1, *ama*, father.
- 2, *ina*, mother.
- 3, *anak* or *wata*, child, nephew, niece, child-in-law.
- 4, probably a term for older sibling: *kaka*.
- 5, probably a term for younger sibling; possibly *ari*.
- 6, probably a generic term for sibling, though this, unless it is *ari*, is scarcely recoverable from the Philippine data alone. The concept, like the words, may be secondary; but its wide prevalence indicates antiquity.
- 7, *apo*, possibly *nono* as alternative, self-reciprocal for grandparents and grandchildren.
- 8, possibly *bapa* for paternal and maternal uncle, father-in-law, stepfather, that is males of the father's generation generically, not excluding the father himself.
- 9, possibly a corresponding term for females of the mother's generation.
- 10, 11, one or two terms for brother-in-law and sister-in-law.
- 12, perhaps a term for parent-in-law.
- 13, *asawa*, spouse.

Other relationships have been expressed by non-kinship words secondarily given a kinship reference in local usage; by including the more remote relationships in the significance of the above primary terms; or by affix or composite derivatives from the primary terms.

The simplicity and adaptability of this system are obvious. It operates with its meager resources by merging most collateral with lineal kin; by mostly treating connections by marriage as if they were blood kin, with the logical implication that spouses are one person; by not distinguishing sex, except in parents, perhaps uncles and aunts, and possibly siblings-in-law; and by nowhere bifurcating, that is, discriminating the line of descent, the sex through which relationship exists. The primary consideration is generation; this is slightly elaborated by hesitating and inconsistent introduction of the factors of collaterality, sex, marriage, and absolute age. Reciprocity is of moment. Self-reciprocal terms occur in every language, and in the Philippines as a whole are found in every class of relationships except the parent-child group.

## LINES OF DEVELOPMENT OF THE ANCIENT SYSTEM.

Intertribal divergences, both as regards specific concepts and the words used, are considerable. This fact indicates an active play of etymological and semantic influences. But departures from the general logical scheme are much slighter, so as to suggest that the subconscious method of conceptualization has been rather tenaciously adhered to.

This is rather remarkable in view of the fact that pagan, Moham-medan, and Christian peoples, coast and mountain dwellers, literate and illiterate tribes, are involved; and that the degree of exposure of the several Philippine nationalities to Indian, Arab, and Spanish cultural influences has been extremely diverse. It is true that the social fabric as such has probably altered less in the Philippines in the past thousand years than religions and knowledge, and certainly less than material arts and industries. But there have been fairly profound variations of general civilization; and theoretically these seem as capable of modifying a scheme of kinship reckoning as are social institutions in their narrower sense. That these variations of general civilization have affected the scheme so little, except in superficial details, shows that a method of thought involved in dealing with blood relationship may sometimes possess a surprising historical tenacity. It is tempting in the present case to attribute this tenacity in part to the simplicity of the principles on which the system is based and the comparatively strict consistency with which they can consequently be adhered to.

It is true that there are differences of kinship system corresponding to the differences of level or type of culture: what is interesting is that they are proportionally so small. The pagan Igorot systems are perhaps somewhat nearest to the original scheme, if the attempted reconstruction of this is approximately correct. Among these, however, the extremely simple systems, as represented by Ifugao, may be partly the result of a progressive and extreme process of reduction. The pagans of Mindanao, if the Subanun are typical, perhaps stand nearest to the pagans of Luzon, though the data are too imperfect for any very valid conclusion. The Mohammedans of Mindanao are still rather close to the generic scheme. If the existence of specific terms for uncle, aunt, and older and younger sibling proves to be ancient, the Moro seem not to have departed more than the Igorot from the original system; if otherwise, Malay influence on the Moro is indicated. The Christian

peoples, so far as the Tagalog may adequately stand for them, have diverged principally in developing special terms for connections by marriage. This may well be due to the influence of Christian law and European usage.

The Malay system, although indubitably resting on the same foundation, has plainly come to differ more from all the Philippine systems than these differ from one another, not only in actual terminology, but in the introduction of several new methods or points of view. Such a divergence is expectable from the more thorough Mohammedanization of the Malays and their much freer contacts with foreign civilizations.

#### CORRESPONDENCE OF INSTITUTIONS AND THE KINSHIP SCHEME.

The principles characterizing native society in the Philippines are:—

1. A lack of political structure or sense, except where foreign influence, chiefly Mohammedan, is clear.
2. The place of political organization is taken by an organization on the basis of actual kinship, modified secondarily by community of residence or economic interests.
3. The stratification of society into wealthy, poor, and economically deficient is emphasized by the translation of these classes into nobility, free, and slaves.
4. There is no chieftainship other than as based on the combination of personal qualities with preëminence among the nobility, that is, precedence in wealth. Exceptions are again due to Mohammedan—or Christian—influence.
5. Property being wholly transmitted by inheritance except for some consumption in sacrifice, and rank inclining to follow wealth, there is a strong tendency for social status to be hereditary.
6. The mechanism of law is economic instead of political. Legal claims are enforced only by the threat or exercise of violence, and adjusted by transfers of property.
7. There are no totems, clans, nor any system of exogamy between artificial kin groups.
8. Women are socially the equals of men. This is clear from their position in marriage, descent, and the holding of property. The division of labor between the sexes is on a physiological rather than a social basis.

The distinctive traits thus are the importance of blood kinship and of economic factors, the insignificance of political and exogamous or "arbitrary" aspects of society, and the non-differentiation of the sexes. These features reveal Filipino society as simple and "natural" in character; that is, close to its biological substratum, and comparatively free from the purely social creations or elaborations that tend to flourish in many other parts of the world.

The kinship schemes accord well with these institutions. The equality of the sexes is reflected in the paucity of the sex-limited terms of relationship and in the total absence of any terms implying the sex of the ego or person to whom the relationship exists. The failure to separate kindred in the male and female line may be connectible with the same equalizing of the sexes in actual life; or with the want of clans and other artificial exogamic groups which in order to maintain their identity must reckon descent unilaterally; or with both factors. The organization of society on a basis of blood is likely to have something to do with the disinclination to distinguish lineal and collateral relatives. Even the tendency to treat the spouse's kin as blood kin may have some connection with the social balance or non-differentiation of the sexes. At any rate, where the social status of men and women is markedly and fortifiedly distinct, it seems extremely unlikely that a man could feel his wife's father to be sufficiently identical with his own father for him to call him father: the psychology of the terminology would clash with the psychology of the relation as it does not clash in Filipino life.

#### THEORETICAL PRINCIPLES INVOLVED.

As to the question whether kinship terminologies may be construed rather as reflecting institutional or linguistic or vaguer psychological conditions, the present material points to the following inferences.

Kinship systems are considerably but superficially modified by linguistic and even dialectic factors. The effect of these factors is great enough to make the prediction of any specific institution from any specific term or set of terms extremely venturesome. Institutions and terminologies unquestionably parallel or reflect each other at least to the degree that a marked discrepancy of plan is rare. Institutions probably shape terminologies causally, but in the main by influencing or permitting a logical scheme. In a sense this logical scheme underlies both institution and terminology, so that the correlation between them, although actual, can be conceived as indirect. Development of particular terms or their denotation under the influence of institutions may occur to a greater or less extent, but is constantly liable to distortion by linguistic factors. The influence on kinship terminology of general levels of culture—those other than narrowly social or institutional ones, seems not to have been seriously examined. The present case shows that such influence may be rather less significant than might be expected in a transition from a state of comparative savagery to one of comparative civilization.



LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 019 953 777 5